

AN IMPARTIAL
ACCOUNT
OF A
CONFERENCE
BETWEEN 491.2
Mr. THOMAS KIRBY,
A Teacher of an
ANABAPTIST-MEETING,
At Goswel-Street, in Glass-House-Yard,
AND A
LAY-MEMBER
OF THE
Church of England,
CONCERNING
Infant-Baptism,
AND
SEPARATION.

Erat est.

L O N D O N: Printed for, and Sold by, J. Baker,
at the Black-Boy, in Pater-Noster-Row, 1711. Price 6 d.

E
in
alw
exc
ren
oppo
its l
min
ble
the
of i
pear
thou
ly m
Chu
sibly
those
ever
propo
A
ples,
I do
batea

T H E
P R E F A C E.

EVER since I had the Happiness of perusing the Works of our ingenuous Clergy, in reference to our unhappy Differences, I have always conceiv'd such a just Veneration for our excellent Establishment, in every Part of it, as render'd me something impatient of hearing it oppos'd wherever I came. The Agreeableness of its Doctrines, (without either Addition or Diminution) to that only Rule of Faith, the Bible; The Consistency of its Government with the Apostolical Times; The Decency and Order of its Discipline and Ceremonies, did ever appear to me so evidently conspicuous, that I thought, (without detracting from any) it fairly merited the Title, of the best constituted Church in the World; and was always so sensibly affected at the strange Unreasonableness of those that desert its Communion, that whenever I had the least Opportunity, I was very propense to express my Resentments to them.

Amongst the many Contests that these Principles, back'd with such a Temper, expos'd me to, I don't know any one single Person, more contributed to the number, than Mr. Amond, the

immediate Cause of the following Conference: For after I had contracted an intimate Acquaintance with him; finding him altogether free from that Moroseness and Austerity of Disposition, (which I have often observ'd, generally clouds the Well-meaning of such unhappy, such deluded Persons) it gave me some Encouragement, that possibly, in Time, he might be made sensible of his Mistakes; and in process thereof, my Reasons had that happy Ascendancy over him, as to make him confess, I had fairly convinc'd him, and that nothing shou'd hinder his strict Adhesion to the Church of England, in case I wou'd stand by what I had said to him, before Mr. Kirby.

Tho' I might, (without any just Cause of Reflection) have very easily declin'd acting correspondent to this his Request, by alledging my Youth, and several other Personal Disadvantages, I necessarily lay under, yet so well assur'd I was of the Cogency of those Reasons I had offer'd to him, that I was not in the least fearful of their standing the Test, of even the subtlest Sophistry; and therefore, after I had just mention'd these things to him, I readily comply'd with his Desire, and told him, I would attend Mr. Kirby at any Time, only desiring, before I actually engag'd in a Dispute with him, I might have a little previous Notice of it, which he promis'd me, so we both determin'd to proceed agreeable to these Resolutions.

After about a Month, or thereabouts, had pass'd without any likelihood of Matters being brought to an issue, I accidentally came to Mr. Amond's House,

The PREFACE V

House, where I found Mr. Kirby, upon which, having discharg'd my self of all that Surprise, and Palpitation of Heart, that in such a Case wou'd naturally assault One of my Age and Circumstances, I commenc'd the Dispute, as hereafter accounted for.

As to the Justice of my procedure, in this Account, with respect to Mr. Kirby, I can solemnly make Affidavit: That after the most attentive Recollection I cou'd possibly make, both of the matter, and manner of his Arguments: I endeavour'd to Write them down, to the utmost of my Memory, in his own Words; but when I found my self fail'd by them: I took really very particular Care, that his Reasons might not be Represented, under the disadvantage of a worse Stile, than he deliver'd them in; and I have that Opinion of his Ingenuity, that I don't believe, he will Charge me, with any ways Dissembling the force of his Arguments; either, as to the Matter, or Phrase of them: Tho' I must confess, (as that great Moralist Seneca, long ago observ'd) that, Nunquam sine querela, tanguntur Aegra. For when Mens Passions, have unhappily prevail'd upon them, to maintain any Error: And (to speak softly) their Interests oblige them, to persist in them, against the clearest Convictions; it is no wonder, that he that endeavours to rectify their Mistakes, finds no other reward for his pains, than severe Reflections, and disingenuous Cavils. But what Ascendancy soever, such vile Motives may have on some Mens Minds; yet that

little

vi The PREFACE.

little Conversation I have had with Mr. Kirby, has given Birth to better Thoughts in me of him, and therefore however, I may be treated by others, I am not very apprehensive of him, who notwithstanding the prejudices of his Opinion, has estrang'd the Natural sweetness of his Disposition: Appears at least, to mean well, and be a Person that can be Civil, even to an Antagonist, which to my knowledge is not common, in Men of his Character.

Tho' it shou'd be granted, upon what has been said, that I have done Mr. Kirby Justice, in what immediately refers to what he said: Yet probably it may be suggested; that I may have made some Additional Improvement to what I said, either by some fresh, and more consider'd Arguments, or some Imbellishments of Stile, with which, I was unprovided with, ex tempore. But to this, I can sincerely rejoyne, that if any had the least advantage of this Nature, by this Transcription, it will be found on Mr. Kirby's side; and that 'tis in every part of it, really what I call it, AN IMPARTIAL ACCOUNT, &c.

Having given the Reader hitherto, a Compendious History, of the occasion and manner of this Conference: It may not be altogether improper to inform him, that since the Writing of these Papers, I have again seen Mr. Kirby, and had some Dispute with him, concerning a National Church: But shou'd I here endeavour to account for what he offer'd as a Reason, to prove a Na-

The PREFACE. vii

a National Church, to be no Church of Christ, (tho' I did it with all the Candor in the World.) it wou'd make this Paper appear, rather a Satyr, than a Preface. For his Reason (as I told him) was of that Nature, that it not only destroy'd the being of a National, but his own; nay, that Church which our Lord made, when he Instituted the Sacrament; and I believe upon cool thinking, he himself will be of my Mind, and esteem me one, who can Omit what wou'd afford me a very fair Opportunity of Triumph.

I suppose I need not take much pains, to inform the Reader, that I have no Interest in offering these Papers to the Press: For the Age so abounds with Learned Performances, not only upon other, but this Subject, that I shall esteem it an ample Reward, if I escape without a Publick Errata of my Defects.

This tho', I hope will recommend me to my Friends, that however defective I may appear, in such an Affair: Yet my Design was Good, and resolutely prosecuted; and has been successful, in the Person of Mr. Amond, who has for a considerable time, given publick Demonstrations, of his being a Member of the Church of England. I wou'd not have it thought, that this Success, has so far flush'd me, as to render me insensible, that even the most accurate Pieces of this Nature, no sooner appear in Publick view, but they are immediately subject, not only to the nice Inspections of the ingenious; but to the surly Castigations, of a parcel of Buzzing insipid

lipid Drones ; who are never wanting of the stinging, whatever they are of the extracting Faculty. And therefore, I am so far from thinking this attempt, will administer the least Opportunity of advancing my Interest, or soothing my Ambition : That probably the most Sagacious and indulgent of my Friends, may esteem it the best excuse that they can make for me, to impute it to be one of the Sallies of that Levity and Vanity, that is common to my Tears.

In fine, did not the consideration, that God Almighty often makes use of the meanest Instruments, in prosecuting the noblest End : And the desire I have of offering my poor Mite, to the Service and Intrest of our Church, and Kingdoms Peace : (by endeavouring to Erace those unhappy prejudices, some have contracted against the former) Make a more sensible impression upon my Mind, than the abject affectation of adulatory Encomiums, or the gratification of some private personal Picque: These Papers had been as obscure as their Author ; for how Averse soever I may be, to the pernicious Principles of some Men ; yet I can sincerely declare, I wish well to the Persons of all Mankind, without exception. But I fear I'm prolix, and therefore shall dismiss my Reader ; having already, too much intruded upon his Patience.

J. SMITH.

A N

A N
IMPARTIAL ACCOUNT
OF A
CONFERENCE, &c.



AFTER common Ceremonies, and some trivial Preliminaries had pass'd between us, I particularly address'd my self to Mr. Kirby to this effect.

Sir, I had the Happiness of hearing you preach a Sermon concerning INFANT BAPTISM, a lit-

tle while ago. Upon this he ask'd me where? Which having told him, he said, *I suppose you did not then bear me say any thing for Infant-Baptism?* At this I smil'd, and said, *If I had, I shou'd have been as much surpriz'd, as I was to see the Two Tables of the Decalogue plac'd on each side*

*this *Pulpit; and believe your Auditory*

wou'd have been as much surpriz'd

as I. After this Mr Amond said,

Sir, This young Man is the Cause of my

Doubts; and therefore I have desired

him to have some Discourse with you, which, with some

reluctancy he has granted. To whom Mr Kirby re-

* The Reason of this was because 'twas a Seventh-Day Meeting-House.

B

ply'd;

ply 1, *Very well.* Then I said, *Since Mr. Amond is pleas'd to Father his Doubts upon me; I must endeavour to account for them, as well as I can.* Here Mr. Kirby seem'd ready to attend to what I wou'd say, so I proceeded, *viz.*

S. You cannot be insensible of the Sense of the Church of *England*, (and, indeed, of all the Reformed Churches) in this Point; her Articles being publick to the View of any One. Now I profess my self a Member of the Church of *England*, and therefore since you deny what She asserts, you are bound, by all the Rules of Dispute, to prove your Negative.

Mr. K. I deny that, you ought to prove it lawful.

S. He that denies a received Opinion, (as is this of *Infant Baptism*) ought, by all the Rules of *Logick*, to prove that Opinion false.

Mr. K. You don't talk as if you understood *Logick*. You ought to prove it true.

S. Suppose here was an *Atheist* in this Room, which deny'd the Being of a GOD. Now we all, no doubt, take the Being of a GOD for granted; therefore he's oblig'd, since he denies it, to prove there is no GOD.

Mr. K. There is no such Thing as proving a Negative. You ought to prove there is a GOD.

S. I must confess, according to that small Notion I had of *Logick*, I thought he ought to have prov'd, that there was no GOD. But, however, I will give you your Choice, either I will prove *Infant-Baptism* lawful, or you shall prove it unlawful.

Mr. K. You prove it lawful.

S. That we may proceed with all possible Clearness, I'll engage my self to make good these Three Propositions, *viz.*

PROP. I.

PROP. I. *That Infants are positively commanded to be Baptized.*

PROP. II. *That Infants are capable Subjects of Baptism. And,*

PROP. III. *That 'tis highly necessary to Baptize them, and highly dangerous to omit it. Are these sufficient?*

Mr. K. Ay! Ay! Prove them, and 'tis enough.

S. Pray Mr. Amond be so kind as to help me to a Bible. [*Upon which he gave me one.*]

Mr. K. By Infants you mean such as are carried in the Arms? Because I don't know what you may mean by an Infant.

S. Yes, yes.

Mr. K. Very well.

S. The Text I urge to prove my First PROPOSITION is this, *Mat. xxviii. 19. Go ye therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* Now I thus argue, All Nations are commanded to be baptized: Children are a Part of Nations; therefore Children are commanded to be baptized. Now, Sir, your Answer.

Mr. K. It is said, *Teach all Nations*, before you baptize them. Teaching is here made pre-requisite to Baptism. But Children are incapable of being Taught; therefore they are not here commanded to be Baptized.

S. I have been credibly inform'd, that this Place, might, with more agreement to the Original, be render'd thus, *Disciple, or Profelyte all Nations*, and not *Teach* them; if we consider the Word as only signifying instructing them.

Mr. K. *Disciple all Nations, i. e. Bring them to the Faith, instruct them, urge them to believe in Jesus Christ.* This is all to the same effect.

S. Then the Word *Teach*, here, may be properly render'd. *Disciple*, or *Profelyte*? You'll admit it?

Mr. K. Yes.

S. Then we may render the Words thus, *Go Disciple, or Profelyte all Nations, how? by baptizing them in the Name, &c.* as was the manner of the Jews, when they made a Child a Profelyte, they immers'd the Child in the Water.

Mr. K. Who told you so?

S. Doctor Hammond.

[*Here there happen'd some Confusion, of which I can give no other account, but that he would not admit the Text to bear that Sense, and I thought it wou'd. So I pass'd this by, and proceeded.*]

S. I wou'd willingly understand you, Sir. Your Argument, I think, is this, Teaching ought to preceed Baptism: but Children cannot be Taught; therefore they ought not to be Baptized. I apprehend you right, don't I, Sir?

Mr. K. Yes.

S. Now I conceive, that this Text is so far from proving that Teaching ought to preceed Baptism; that it intimates quite the contrary by your own Argument. For if the Word *Teach* in the beginning of the Verse, may be render'd *Disciple*, or *Profelyte*, (as you confess it may) then are they Commanded in this Text, (if we consult the order of Words) to be first Baptized and then Taught; *Go Baptize all Nations, Teaching them*

them to observe, &c. as you may see in the next Verse ; so that here, they are to be Taught, after they were Baptized.

Mr. K. I know that, who denies it? to be sure they must be Taught after Baptism, as well as before.

[Here was a little sort of a Feud, during which little material pass'd; only I said, that Teaching cou'd not by these Words be inferr'd, necessarily to preceed Baptism: And he thought it cou'd; so we (to the best of my Memory) agreed to pass this by. And went on.]

S. But we'll omit this, and consider the Words in two distinct Propositions, as they lye before us, viz. *Go Teach, and Baptize.* Now I Argue, it is granted, Children are incapable of being taught: But Children are capable of being Baptized; ergo, &c.

Mr. K. There are three sorts of Persons, that never were intended by this Commission to be Baptiz'd, (who were all a Part of Nations) Fools, Mad Men, and Children. Your own Clergy wont Baptize a Fool, or a Mad-Man; and it is certain, that an Infant is as Incapable, as either of them.

S. It is very certain, that Children are included in this Command; but whether they are capable Subjects of it, comes more immediately under my next Proposition; and therefore if you please we'll proceed to that.

Mr. K. The Children of Infidels are a part of Nations: What! must they be Baptized?

S. No, only such as are Born of Believing Parents.

Mr. K.

Mr. K. Why then I will bring two Infants of a Month Old, the one a Christian's, and the other an Infidel's Child: And I defie the Learnedst Man in the World to distinguish them. How then shall I know, which of these I ought to Baptize, since there is no visible difference between them?

S. Your Rule is, the Profession of them that offer them to be Baptized. But I must needs tell you, asking of Questions, is not solving of Difficulties. This is not Disputing when all's done.

Mr. K. The Papists Baptize Bells, they are a part of Nations: What! must they be Baptized?

S. They are not Humane Creatures. [*These and a great many more Questions to this effect, Mr. Kirby put to me, which at present I can't recollect; being something Confus'd, at his starting them. So after some time had pass'd, in mutual Wranglings I said.*] If you please Sir, we will proceed to the Second Proposition

Mr. K. You han't prov'd your first yet.

[*This be often repeated throughout the Conference, with an Air of Triumph.*]

S. If I han't I will. Come pray Sir, lets be Direct. Baptize all Nations, is this a true Proposition?

Mr. K. Yes.

S. Children are a Part of Nations, is this true?

Mr. K. Yes.

S. Therefore Children are commanded to be Baptized. [*Here we wrangl'd for a considerable time, during which, he made several Objections: But they all refering to the incapacity of an Infant for Baptism, I shall account for them under the Second Proposition; in the interim, we proceeded as follows.*]

S.
first
Lor
me,
Hea
M
me,
to p
so m
S.
tion
For
the c
must
posit
may
Com
espe
Com
is no
us f
that
only
to suff
they
Bapt
ly A
bim.
them
Lord
Triu
to be
Earth
me.
Arm
Shall

S. I must needs add, as a further Proof of my first Proposition, these Words of our Blessed Lord; (*Mat. 19. 14*) *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Mr. K. It is the strangest thing in the World to me, that ever any Man shou'd bring this Text to prove Infant-Baptism: For the Text does not so much as mention Baptism at all!

S. It must be confess'd, that it does not mention Baptism; but it very strongly impliyes it, For if Baptism be an Innitiatory Sacrament, and the only way, (as far as we know) by which we must come to Christ; since Children are here positively Commanded to come to Christ: It may be very naturally inferr'd, that they are here Commanded to be Baptized, in order so to do; especially if it be consider'd, that we are here Commanded, *to suffer them to come to him*; now it is not easy to conceive, why our Lord shou'd bid us *suffer them, &c.* In case he had not meant that we shou'd Baptize them: That being the only way, by which we cou'd properly be said, *to suffer them to come unto him.* For if he design'd they shou'd come to him any other way, but by Baptism: Certainly he had never so particularly Address'd himself to us; *to suffer them to come to him. Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, &c.* Besides, that those which our Blessed Lord himself, Pronounc'd capable of his Church Triumphant in Heaven, shou'd be thought unfit to be Members of the Church Militant here on Earth, seems strange, yea really, very strange to me. Shall the Blessed Jesus receive them into his Arms, and we cast them out of the Church? Shall he embrace them with the most endearing expressions

expressions of Affection; and we reject them? Surely this cannot, ought not be.

[This I urg'd very pressingly. So : that like true Disputants, we again Jangled, during which, the same Arguments were repeated on both sides : And Mr. Kirby objected several things against the Capacity of an Infant for Baptism. So after he had several times deny'd that I had prov'd my first Proposition, we agreed to examine the second Proposition, viz. Children are Capable Subjects of Baptism.]

Mr. R. If the Church of England, acted Consistent with her own Principles, She wou'd do as we. For when the Question is ask'd in her Catechism, What is required of Persons to be Baptized? It is answer'd, Repentance from Dead Works, and Faith towards God. Now it is certain, that Infants are incapable either of Faith, or Repentance : Therefore, according to this Place, ought not to be Baptiz'd.

S. It is granted, that Faith and Repentance are required of Persons to be Baptized : But then it is to be consider'd, that this is only requir'd of Adult Persons ; as when St. Peter had Preach'd so searchingly to his Auditors, (as we find in the *Acts*) that they were Cut to the Heart, and cry'd out, *What shall we do?* He answers Repent, and be Baptiz'd, &c. You that have so Impiously imbrued your Hands, in the Blood of the Lord of Life and Glory, Repent and be Baptiz'd, and ye shall receive the Remission of your Sins. *For the Promise is unto you, and your Children, &c.* These and such like words, (which your Opinion so particularly insist on.) are to be consider'd as occasional and adapted to the Circumstances

of them, to whom they are spoken. So that when our Church mentions Faith and Repentance, to be required of Persons to be Baptiz'd: She is to be understood, to give an account of what is requir'd in general, without descending to particular Cases. For tho' it is said in many places of Scripture, *REPENT and be Baptiz'd*: Yet you can't be insensible, of its being said to the Keeper in the *Acts*; *Believe on the Lord Jesus, &c.* and our Lord himself says, *He that Believeth and is Baptized, shall be Sav'd*: Without ever mentioning Repentance: So that if it can be prov'd, that Infants have Faith, they are sufficiently qualify'd for Baptism. For *he that Believeth and is Baptiz'd, shall be Sav'd*.

Mr. K. What! Dont you know your own Catechism? That, says, *Repentance is to be required of Persons Baptized*.

S. The very Notion of Repentance, loses its Essence, where actual Transgressions are wanting. For Repentance, is a reflecting with Sorrow, upon our past Actions; and since Infants are Incapable of those Actions, (which Administer Cause for Repentance) or, indeed, of any at all: The Cause actual Transgressions, being wanting in them, the Effect Repentance, must of necessity be the same. And indeed, Repentance is not required of Adult Persons, so much to render them Capable, or qualify'd for Baptism, as for the Remission of Sins; as if you was to Preach to any one, that you knew to be guilty of Adultery, &c. You say to such a one, Repent of your Adultery, &c. So that when we find, St. Peter in the *Acts*, and several other
C Passages

Passages, in the Holy Book, require Repentance; to preceed Baptism, they are only occasional Discourses, Adapted to the Circumstances of those, to whom they are apply'd to; and therefore cannot reasonably be urg'd as general Rules. You that have committed actual Transgressions, Repent of them And this our Churches practice, evidences is her meaning in her Catechism. [*Here many interruptions mutually pass'd between us, there being nothing material in what was offer'd on both sides: but was more regularly mention'd, either before, or will be consider'd in what follows*]

S If it can be prov'd that a Child has Faith, I suppose you will grant, that it ought to be Baptiz'd. For the Scripture expressly says, *He that Believeth*, &c.

Mr. K. Yes, Yes, prove a Child has Faith, and 'tis enough.

S. Very well, Why then I'll use St. Paul's Argument, *if (says he) the ROOT be Holy, the Branches also are HOLY*: Now (say I) if the Root, or Parents be Faithful, the Branches, or Children also are Faithful. This I hope, you wont reject, because 'tis the Great Apostle of the *Gentiles* own Argument.

Mr. K. You have a wrong Notion. It is true, it was become a Proverb amongst the *Jews*, that *the Fathers had eaten sour Grapes*, whereby the Childrens Teeth were set an Edge: But the Scripture informs us of the contrary; that says, *the Soul that sins shall dye*; and adds, that neither the Righteousness, nor Unrighteousness of the Parents, shall be imputed to the Children. So that your Arguing, that the Children are there-
fore

fore Faithful, because their Parents are so ; is a meer Fancy. Besides, you will find it a difficult task to distinguish those who are the Children of the Faithful, from others ; How then will you know which to Baptize ?

S. It may possibly be something difficult, to define what, and who are the Children of the Faithful ; but yet I conceive, we have sufficient Reason for the Baptizing them, notwithstanding.

Mr. K. You say very right, it is something difficult, to define who are the Children of the Faithful ; as for the Infants of *Heathens*, you allow they must not be Baptiz'd : (tho' it must be remember'd, they also are a part of Nations.) Because their Parents are not Faithful ; therefore according to your Argument, they are Unfaithful ; and as such, ought not to be Baptized.

[This, and something more, to the same effect, Mr. Kirby express'd, with a peculiar Air of Triumph, at these my Inadvertent (for so I confess they were) Expressions ; Rowz'd by which, after some Recollection ; I proceeded as follows.]

S. It is a very easy matter to explode any thing. For tho' it is confess'd, we cannot easily distinguish, who are the Children of the Faithful, if we may not Judge of them, by their Profession who offer them. Yet it is certainly true, we are as Capable of knowing who are the Children of the Faithful, as you are of knowing who is Faithful, of even Adult Persons, without their Professing their Faith. And in-

deed, tho' a bare Profession of Faith, will not render a Man qualify'd for the Kingdom of Heaven: Yet it certainly renders him and his Seed, Capable of Baptism, and all other Church Priviledges here upon Earth. [*This last Clause, he by repeated Questions, made me renew several times; after which, we Squabbled a little, and then proceeded*]

S. However the preceeding Argument may be Evaded: Yet I conceive, this is so convincing, that it wont be deny'd. [*Here I read the 18 Chap. of Mat. till I came to these Words,*] *Whosoever shall wrong one of these little O N E S, which Believe in me, it were better for him, that a Mill-stone were, &c* Here our Blessed Lord himself declares, Children have Faith; they have Faith in him; and therefore how can you, how dare you, who stile yourself his Minister, deny them Baptism?

Mr. K. This is the strangest thing in the World, that you shou'd urge this Text for Infant Baptism. There is not one Minister of the Church, that ever brought this as a Proof. I remember the Saying of a Great Prelate, of your own Church, *viz. To Argue that Children have FAITH, is certainly a sign of want, of better Argument.* Your own Church does not take the Text, in that Sense which you do.

S. Since you and I are engag'd in a private Dispute, you are oblig'd by all the Rules of it, to Answer me directly. If I have been so unhappy, in the choise of my Proof, as you Represent me; you'll have the less Work to Refute me; but to put me off with what our own Church says, &c. I can't be satisfy'd, with such
an

an Answer. In short Sir, if you tell me of never so many of our Church, who think otherwise of this Passage: I dont esteem my self oblig'd to regard them. You have heard my Argument, of you therefore, I expect an Answer.

Mr K. What! won't you use your Reason in the reading the Scripture? At this rate you may admit the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. The Words are not to be taken literally, but are spoken of the Disciples of *Christ*, whom he very frequently calls *Little Children*.

S. Yes, Sir, I will use my Reason, which tells me this Place can't possibly admit of your Construction. For the Place I refer to, is purely a History, and ought, (if any Part of Scripture ought to be so) to be taken in its most natural, and familiar Sense. The History then is this: Our Saviour *takes up a little Child in his Arms*, (for so St. Mark says) *and set it in the midst of his Disciples*; upon which he deduces a Discourse, till he comes to the Words I refer to. Now that that this Passage is to be understood of an Infant, I thus prove.

The Place is purely Historical, *He took a Child*. It is confess'd, when our Lord addresses himself to his Disciples in the Appellative of *Little Children*; and St. John says, *Little Children, keep yourselves from Idols*, they are to be understood to speak of adult Persons, the Name of *little Children*, being a Paternal and affectionate way of speaking, and therefore cannot be understood any otherways. As if Mr. *Amos* shou'd call his Wife,
Child,

Child, &c. [*Here I pointed to Mrs. Amond*] it would not properly be understood in the common Acceptation of the Word, but only as an endearing, and affectionate Expression. But now it is not so in this Place; for the Person here call'd *Child*, is not spoken to, but of, and therefore is to be understood to be such a Person, as this Name commonly imports; the Passage being, as I before said, purely Historical.

But, further, it is said, our Lord *took him in his Arms, and set him in the midst*. Now it is impossible for us to conceive, that he should take an adult Person up in his Arms. As to what you say, concerning *Transubstantiation*, I'll be ready to consider it, when you have prov'd, what I have offer'd, carries any Parity with it.

[*Here, after many Words had pass'd between us, with some Warmth, and Confusion, Mr. K. ask'd me to let him see the Bible, which I immediately gave him, upon which he turn'd to the Place disputed upon, and read the Context; at which I ask'd him, whether he thought the Passage was not to be understood of a Child, to the 5th Verse. This I distinctly put to him at every Verse, as he read them. To which he reply'd, Yes, but would by no means admit the Sixth Verse to be understood of a Child, and proceeded more regularly to give his Reasons, as follows.*]

Mr. K. It can't be imagin'd, that *Children*, who are incapable of having any Knowledge of even Temporal Things, should have any Notion of Spiritual Things, which are, in their Nature
far

far m
ficult
Text
the P
for t
posit
know
will
you
pose
to te
Beha
tatio
in th
near
Wro
of h
press
the 7

S.
am
stood
viou
cien
know
more
you
tiz'd
says
Whi
or o
belie
lieve

far more sublime, and, consequently, more difficult to be understood. Besides, if you take all Texts of Scripture Literally, you must join with the *Papists*, in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; for they'll say, as you say here, that *Christ* says positively, *This is my Body*; and it must be acknowledged, if the Words be taken literally, they will bear that Sense they give them. What! do you think God gave us our Reason to no purpose? Our Saviour's design, in this Place, is to teach us Humility, and therefore, offers the Behaviour of a *little Child*, as proper for our imitation; but his expressing himself, as he does in the Sixth Verse, is only to let us know how nearly he esteems himself concern'd in the Wrongs that are offer'd to the meanest, the least of his Disciples. For as the Apostle well expresses it, *with the Heart Man believes, and with the Tongue Confession is made unto Salvation.*

S. Yes Sir, I will use my Reason, and by it am convinc'd, that this Passage is to be understood of a *little Child*, because it is said our Saviour *took him up in his Arms*. If this is not sufficient to prove it was a Child, I wou'd fain know what is? What wou'd you have me say more? If a Child can be prov'd to have Faith, you your self will grant it ought to be baptiz'd: Here I bring a Place that positively says it has Faith, it has Faith in *Jesus Christ*. Which then must I believe in this Case, *You*, or our Saviour? since he says positively it does believe, and you say it cannot, it does not believe.

Mr. R.

Mr. K. 'Tis false! He does not say a Child does believe, he speaks of his Disciples. The Words are not to be taken literally, no more than these Words, *This is my Body*. It is impossible a Child should believe.

S. I perceive you are something of *Nicodemus's* Mind, *how can these things be?* How can a Child believe? And here, I must confess, I can't answer you: I don't pretend, particularly, to define the Nature of a Child's Faith; but yet, I think, I have sufficient Reason to think it has Faith, or something analogous to it, upon our Saviour's bare Word. Besides, I don't conceive it so irrational as you represent it, that a Child should have Faith: Was we only to argue *ex natura rei*, from the Nature of the Thing only. For, to my Knowledge, it is a receiv'd Maxim in Philosophy, *That a Soul does not vegetate, or grow, either in Bulk or Properties, like a Body, but is equally capable of all those Actions in a Child, (in it self abstracted from the weakness of the Organs by which it exerts it self) as we find are the Effects of it, when the Body is grown to a sufficient Strength and Maturity for it to display it self visibly to us.* But you'll say, perhaps, these are Subtilties in which we are not concern'd; and I don't pretend, indeed, much to insist on them, but yet I thought I would just mention them, because you have so particularly urg'd the Unreasonableness of the Thing. And now because you have so much insisted upon the Parity of my taking the Words of our Lord, before us, in a literal Sense, and the *Papists* taking these Words, *This is my Body*, so. I shall a little consider, whether,

ther,
will
tle co
know
the L
to be
Words
Gram
suffici
Words
Now
gainst
Notio
to it
was in
Latin
yet th
their I
presen
Saviou
the Ve
ture T
monly

Mr.
Seven
signific

S. T
here I
them I
Doctri

As
of the
made to

ther, if these Words be taken literally, they will bear their Sense. He must be very little conversant with the *Papists*, that does not know that they affect mightily to argue from the *Latin* Testament; and, at least, pretend to be very strict Grammarians. Now if the Words, as we find them in the *Latin*, won't Grammatically bear their Sense; then I have sufficient Reason to deny the Parity. The Words then are these, *hoc est Corpus meum*. Now the Gender of the Article *hoc*, is against them. For *Panis*, which is, by their Notion, here suppos'd to be the Substantive to it, is of the Masculine Gender; so that, was it so, it would render the Place false *Latin*. But supposing this cou'd be eluded, yet the *Tense* of the *Verb* utterly overthrows their Doctrine: For the *Verb est* is put in the present *Tense*. But, it is very certain, if our Saviour intended the Words in their Sense, the *Verb* ought to have been put in the future *Tense*. Besides, the Word *est*, is very commonly in Scripture put for *it signifies*.

Mr. K. It is so, as when *Joseph* says, *The Seven Ears of Corn, are Seven Years of plenty*, i. e. signify seven Years of Plenty.

S. Therefore you see, if we take the Words here literally, yet the Grammar won't let them bear that Sense. And so much for the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

As to what you insinuate from those Words of the Apostle, *with the Tongue Confession is made to Salvation*. I answer, That 'tis not said, that

that *with the Tongue Confession is made to Baptism*. The Scripture does not say, *he that confesses he believes shall be baptiz'd*, but, *he that believeth, and is baptiz'd, &c.* Faith is the Act of the Heart, and not of the Tongue. And since I have gone so far, I must add, Tho' you said, at first, That none of our own Church-Authors took this Text in the same Sense I do; yet I am not altogether abandon'd there neither. For I assure you, the Martyr *Philpot*, who was burnt for the *Protestant* Religion, urges the very same Text, as a Proof that Infants have Faith. Therefore you was mistaken, when you said none of our Clergy ever produc'd the Place for *Infant-Baptism*: For he insists upon it very much, in his Letter upon that Subject.

Mr. K. I did not say all.

S. You forget your self, I am sure you did. But be that as it will; from what has been said, it is sufficiently manifest, that our Saviour says a Child has Faith, and if it is not sufficiently prov'd to you, I must needs say, I despair of ever proving any thing to you; tho' I can, and did design to insist upon some other Arguments.

Mr. K. 'Tis false, our Saviour says no such Thing.

S. Nay, then it is come to your Denying, and my Affirming. I say its true, he does say so.

[Here

[*Here we were both peremptory, he in his Negative, and I in my Affirmative. So, after some Heat, and many Repetitions, we proceeded.*]

S. We will omit this, and suppose, as you say, Children do not believe. Now it is said, *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved:* But, *He that believeth not, shall be damn'd.* Children, you say, do not believe, therefore Children are damn'd. Oh barbarous Consequence! Will you admit it?

Mr. K. Will you say, I say so? I say no such thing.

S. 'Tis true, you don't say so, but you say they don't believe, and then the *Text* says they are damn'd.

Mr. K. What! Do you think God will damn Children for what they are incapable of performing. The *Text* does not speak of Children.

S. I must needs say, This is sooner exclaim'd against than answer'd. Let any One judge, who gives most occasion for such warm Expressions, You or I. I am so far from pronouncing this dismal Sentence upon Children, that from this Place I infer they do believe, because they are sav'd, and urge the sad Consequence of the contrary, to you, to fright you to agree with me. *He that believeth not, says the Text, shall be damn'd:* but Children are

say'd, *ergo*, they do believe. This is what I infer from this Place.

[*Here we contended some time, without any material addition; after which we proceeded.*]

S. It is said in the Scripture, *Except a Man be born of Water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* From hence I thus argue, Children are capable of being Partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven, (for so our Lord himself pronounces them.) But, except they be baptiz'd, they cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; *ergo*, they are capable of Baptism. This, I think, is a good *Sylogism*.

Mr. K. *Sylogism*! Don't talk of *Sylogisms*— It is said, *except a Man*, &c.

S. *Except a Man*! why then a Woman may be say'd without Baptism. I wonder you admitted Mrs. *Amoud* there to Baptism, she's a Woman, and therefore not included in the *Text*.

We have a common Saying, *Iesus Hominum Salvator*, which, indeed, in the *Latin* here, includes both Sexes; but as we commonly express our selves in the *English*, viz. *Iesus the Saviour of Men*, the Women wou'd be here also excluded. Again, it is said, *without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord.* No *Man*, it may be here argu'd, but a Woman may; with many other Instances of the like Nature.

The

The Words are to be understood, except any one, without any Discrimination, either of Age or Sex.

Mr. K. It is said also, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*, i. e. you cannot be sav'd. So that here you see is an [*except*] as well as in the *Text* you speak of; why then do you not let Children partake of the *Lord's-Supper*?

S. This is down-right flying of the Question; which is not, Whether Children ought to be admitted to the *Lord's-Supper*, but, Whether they ought to be admitted to *Baptism*?

Mr. K. *Flying of the Question*! Well, but it is certain, that if Children are capable of *Baptism*, they are also capable of the *Lord's-Supper*; and this several Learned Men have largely insisted on. For if Children be the Disciples of *Christ*, (and such they are, if they are capable of *Baptism*) why then do you deny them admittance to the *Lord's-Supper*? Especially considering it is said, *except you eat the Flesh, &c.* And, indeed, formerly this was practis'd in the Church; and *St. Austin*, (as you call him) pleads for it, from these Words.

S. Where pray? I believe you are mistaken. For *St. Austin*, I think verily, argues against the Practice.

[*This Mistake, (for so I am now convinc'd it was, in me) I fell into, by having an Eye*

to some of St. Austin's Words, after he had retracted this Error; for, upon a further Scrutiny, I find him really culpable of it; tho' I then thought I was very positive in the matter.]

Mr. K. I can show you the Passage in Dr. Taylor. I have the Book at home.

S. I believe you are mistaken, indeed Sir. But, however, since you urge the Question so much, I answer, That we deny Children admittance to the *Lord's Supper*, because they are incapable of it.

Mr. K. They are as capable of that, as *Baptism*, and do understand One as well as the Other.

S. That I deny. For Children are incapable of receiving any benefit from the participation of the *Lord's Supper*; the main End of that, being, with the Bread and Wine, to infuse, into our Souls, such Rays, or Sparks, of Divine Grace, (which we understand by the Names of the *Body and Blood of Christ*) as will render us more capable of acting agreeable to the Dictates of Christianity, than naturally we are capable of. In Sum, The *Lord's Supper* is design'd to assist us in actual Performances, God having substituted it, as a Means by which he will more immediately convey his Grace into us. But now Children being incapable of any Action, either good or bad, they consequently are incapable of receiving any Benefit by this Ordinance, because it is design'd

to be assistant to us, in our actual Performances. It is confess'd; they understand One as well as the Other, (as you say) but since they are incapable of receiving any Benefit from One as well as the Other, to what purpose would the admitting them to this Ordinance be? Their Incapacity of understanding the Nature of *Baptism*, does not in the least render them incapable of it. For is it not very possible for me to have a real Benefit conferr'd upon me, without my Knowledge? Suppose you had a Child, that had a Wound in its Leg, because this Child is incapable of understanding the particular Salve, (which the Surgeon applies to it) is naturally dispos'd, or fitted, to cure its Malady; wou'd you therefore hinder him from applying it to the Place agriev'd? Wou'd the Benefit the Child receiv'd, by the Cure, be any thing the less, because it does not apprehend the Means by which 'twas effected? And the Case before us is the same. For by the Fall of *Adam*, we all, Young and Old, contracted such Guilt, as renders us, (to use the Words of *St. Paul*) *the Children of Wrath*; now as a Remedy against this epidemic Disease, our Blessed Lord has prescrib'd *Baptism*; and is't not a strange degree of Folly and Madness in us to refuse to apply this most excellent Remedy to Children, because they are incapable of comprehending of it? They are capable of receiving of the Benefit resulting from it, and that abundantly qualifies them for it, notwithstanding all the Defects of their Knowledge. Besides, the Children of the *Jews*, tho' they were admitted to *Circumcision* in their Infancy, yet they were excluded

excluded from being at the *Passover*, till they came to Years of Maturity. Now, whatever you may think of this, it seems to me a good Argument; That since *Circumcision* was the Type of *Baptism*; the same Command that oblig'd them to Circumcise their Children at Eight Days old, equally obliges us to Baptize our Children; nothing less than a direct Prohibition to the contrary, being able to discharge us from the Obligation.

Mr. K. Were there, indeed, any Place in the *New Testament*, which says, *Baptize your Children at Eight Days old*: You might say so, but since no such Place is to be found, you must quit that Argument.

S. The same Command that oblig'd the *Jews* to Circumcise their Children, which was then the Rite of Admission into the Church; obliges us, (without it be somewhere prohibited) to Baptize our Children, which is now the Rite of Admission into the Christian Church. Or take it thus, Children were capable of being admitted Members of the *Jewish* Church; for so they were esteem'd, by God himself; But Children are as capable of being Members of the *Christian*, as they were of the *Jewish*; ergo, (without they be prohibited) they may, and ought, to be admitted into the *Christian* Church.

[Here again happen'd some Confusion, after which Mr. Kirby proceeded, as follows.]

Mr. K.

Mr. K. Faith and Repentance, are requir'd of all Persons to be Baptized: But Children have neither Faith nor Repentance; *Ergo*, they ought not to be Baptized. You talk of Logick, Which do you deny, my Major, or my Minor?

[This I desired him to repeat; so after we were agreed, we understood each other, I reply'd.]

S. Your Minor. For Children, I have prov'd have Faith.

Mr. K. Christ's Baptism is plentifully reveal'd in the Gospel: But Infant Sprinkling, is nowhere reveal'd in the Gospel, *Ergo*, Infant Sprinkling, is not Christ's Baptism.

S. I deny your Minor, Infant Sprinkling, (as you call it,) is reveal'd in the Gospel.

Mr. K. There are several Instances, of Believers Baptism: But there is not one of Infants.

S. That is no Argument, that there were none. It is very certain, there were a great many things done, then, of which we have no account. Besides, if there are no Instances, I am at a loss to conceive, what those Words in the *Acts*, which mentions *Lydia*, and the *Keeper*, and all his House Import.

[After this, there was nothing (as I can remember) but Repetitions, till I proceeded as follows]

E

The

S. The Circumstances that Children are under, seems to me, to render them very Capable of Baptism. For the Apostle, expressly says, *We are all by Nature, the Children of Wrath.* All, without any exception, Young and Old, Children, as well as Men and Women. Now since Baptism, is the only means, that we know of, to Adopt them, the Children of Grace; I think, we have all the Reason in the World, to admit them to it. But I know you think, I proceed upon a false Supposition here, because that you deny, that there is any such thing, as Original Sin, which we Contracted, by the Unhappy Fall, of our First Parents.

Mr. K. You are mistaken, I deny no such thing.

S. Why then, this strongly demonstrates, the Capacity of Infants for Baptism. For since the Regeneration of our Natures, is absolutely necessary to qualifie us, for the Kingdom of Heaven, (as our Lord told *Nicodemus* it was) and Baptism, is the only means we know of to do it: And is therefore called by *St. Paul, the washing of Regeneration*; to deny Children admittance to it, because as you say, they dont understand it, seems to me, a strange unreasonable thing. What! is an *Eternal Weight of Glory*, of no value to Children, because they cant understand it? And to deny them Baptism, is as much as in us lies, to hinder their being Masters of it. For we are all by Nature, the Children of Wrath.

Mr. K.

Mr. K. Tho' Children are guilty of Original Sin, yet Original Sin, will never Damn any one ; and tho' it is said, *We are all by Nature, the Children of Wrath*: Yet Wrath in this Place, is not to be taken for Damnation. And that Passage you Refer to in *Titus*, does not speak of Baptism.

S. No ! I am sure I always took it, to refer to Baptism, and I believe, I am not alone. And as to what you say, concernig Original Sin ; I must confess, that all Sin, I thought, was Damnable: And that the Word Wrath, did more Emphatically, than Ordinary, signifie Damnation in the *New Testament* ; but this I wont insist on. I wou'd only crave leave to offer one Argument more upon this PROPOSITION, *viz.*

The Character our Saviour goes by in the Scripture, strongly insinuates the Capacity of Infants for Baptism. You cannot be insensible, that our Lord goes very frequently in the Scripture, by the Name of a Shepherd. So he calls himself, *I am the good Shepherd*, &c. and St. Peter says, *we were all as Sheep a stray ; but now are return'd to the Shepherd*, &c. with many more to the same Effect ; and his Church is call'd, *his Flock*.

Mr. K. This is all very true, and what then ?

S. Now certainly, a Flock consists of a Lamb's, as well as Sheep ; but your notion, cuts them all of, and makes our Lords Flock, all Sheep: Such a Flock, as never Shepherd had !

Mr. K. Well, But there are Wolves too, amongst the Flock often.

S. I know that.

[Here I Smil'd.]

Mr. K. This I must confess, is new to me: I believe this, is all your own.

S. Let it be whose it will, it fairly maintains what I brought it for. I say, it strongly insinuates, Infants Capacity for Baptism.

[This was all that was material, upon the Second PROPOSITION, I now proceed to the Third and Last.]

S. It is highly necessary to Baptize Children, and highly dangerous to omit it.

Here I'll again, urge this Text, viz. *Except a Man be born of Water, and the Spirit, &c.* Without Baptism, there is no entrance into the Kingdom of God; Ergo, 'tis highly necessary, to Baptize Children.

Mr. K. Do you think that all Heathens Children are Damn'd? Why they were never Baptiz'd.

S. No I dont.

Mr. K. Look here now, you contradict yourself; here you tell me, without Baptism, there is not any entrance to Heaven: And yet you dont think, the Children of Heathens, are Damn'd:

Damn'd : Notwithstanding, they are not Baptized.

[This I believe be urg'd, and very vehemently too, above half a dozen times.]

S. It is very certain, we cannot have any assurance of Salvation without Baptism. For God, has no where declared, that he will Save any without Baptism : But has made Baptism the ordinary means to do it ; and tho' he is no ways confin'd to any Laws, so as not to be able, to dispence with them, as we are : Yet it is a matter of doubt, whether he will dispence with them or no ; especially, when they are willfully neglected. I dont in the least deny, but that God, can Save without Baptism : But the Question is, whether he will, or no ; and therefore certainly, it is most safe, to Baptize our Children, upon which, they can lay Claim to the Promise of God : But without it, have nothing to say for themselves in that Nature ; and consequently, 'tis highly necessary for us, to offer them to it.

[Here Mr. Kirby charg'd me, with being inconsistent with my self, because I confess'd it possible, for a Child to be Sav'd without Baptism ; but yet said, we cou'd not be assur'd of it. Upon which, after many words had pass'd, I said, I was sure, he, nor no Man in the World, was able to prove from the reveal'd Will of God, that Salvation, was to be had without Baptism ; and therefore, I thought we had all the Reason in the World

to esteem it, highly necessary. But notwithstanding Mr. Kirby still persisted in charging me with Inconsistency ; so abundance of Words pass'd, in which, were to the best of my Memory, no alteration from what has already been presented, except in the manner of expression.]

S. It is highly dangerous, to Omit the Baptizing of Infants. Behold says the Royal Psalmist, *I was shapen in Iniquity, and in Sin, did my Mother conceive me.* And St. Paul as you heard just now, declares, *we are all by nature, the Children of Wrath.* Now as a means, to Purge us from our innate Corruption our Blessed Lord has substituted Baptism, without which, (as we know of) there is no other Method, whereby we can quit our selves of it. And therefore for you to say, that Children, (who are equally included under this Innate Depravity, with Adult Persons) I say to assert, as you do, they can, they may, be notwithstanding Regenerated, and so render'd capable of Salvation, without Baptizing, is certainly, to depend upon an Unwritten, if not a False Tradition ; especially considering, Baptism is so Emphatically call'd, *The washing of Regeneration* ; as if that was the only intent of it.

Mr. K. Those Words, do not speak of Baptism.

S. Nay, but they do ;

[Here nothing more was added, on either side, but

but down right Negatives and Affirmatives;
 some time being spent, in which, and mutual
 Wranglings and Repetitions : I address'd my
 self to Mr. Amond, in these Expressions,
 viz. You have heard Mr. Amond what the
 Gentleman has said against Infant Baptism,
 and what I have said for it : I Pray God
 Almighty direct you. To which, I think all
 Present, said Amen. After which, Mr.
 Kirby said ;]

Mr. K. Tho' we shou'd admit, that Infants
 ought to be Baptized : Yet we can't be recon-
 cil'd to your way of Sprinkling them. For
 that, is not properly Baptism, but *Rantism* ;
 Baptizing, being acknowledg'd by all the
 Learned ; to signifie Dipping, or Plunging in
 the Water ; and was you to Consult a *Lexicon*,
 you wou'd find it so. And we find in this
 manner, Our Lord, and the Eunuch were Bap-
 tiz'd ; now 'tis worth inquiry, how you came
 so evidently, to vary from what was then
 Practis'd.

S. As to the *Modus* of Baptizing, whether
 it be by immersion or Sprinkling, I cant con-
 ceive it any ways Essential, so Water and the
 Words be used. And our Church allows of
 either, as the Friends of the Child desires.

Mr. K No ! Why Sprinkling is not Baptism.
 The Word signifies to Dip, or overwhelm in
 the Water ; and we have several Instances,
 of Persons Baptized in this manner ; but not
 one, of their being Sprinkled.

S. Do

S. Do you think then, the quantity of Water is essential in Baptism? But, however, what need this breed a Controversie, since our Church will admit any Child to be dip'd, whose Friends requires it? I must confess, I am wholly incapable of consulting a *Lexicon*: *Greek* being truly *Greek* to me; but I am inform'd, that the Word *Baptize*, in the Original, signifies, to *Wash*, or *Sprinkle*, as well as to *Dip*; and that Place in which we read, *The Pharisees eat not, except they wash their hands*, is, in the *Greek*, the same Word, as we render *Baptize*. And we read, that *the Israelites were all baptized with a Cloud*, i. e. the Rain sprinkled them. And we read also of Persons baptized, which it is very improbable to think were dip'd, such as were sick, or the like. As to our Saviour's, and the Apostles Practice, I can't conceive them any further obligatory, than his eating the Passover in an Upper-Room, with many other Circumstances, which may be varied, as best suits the Conveniency of those concerned in them.

[Thus ended our Dispute, concerning INFANT-BAPTISM, after which, Mrs. Amond said, There was another Thing, which was the Subject of Her Husband's Doubts, and that was, he was apprehensive of being guilty of SCHISM, in separating from the Church of England, upon which, Mr. Kirby said.]

Mr. K. What is Schism?

S. Really,

S. Really, Sir, I am very much spent, having a weak Voice, and therefore would beg you to desist any further Dispute upon that Point; and I will engage my self to meet you at any other Time, fully to consider it.

[*This I repeated with some Importunity, notwithstanding Mr. Kirby urg'd the Question, upon which, after a Hem! I said.*]

S. 'Tis making a Scisure or Rent in the Church and dividing into Parties, and Factions, as they did in the Church of Corinth, when One said, *I am for Paul*, Another, *I am for Apollo*, &c. and, as 'tis here, (God knows we are too sensible of it) I am a *Presbyterian*, I am an *Anabaptist*, I am a *Quaker*, &c. In a Word, it breaks Charity, and all that is lovely and engaging in Christianity, and has a fatal Influence upon every thing that contributes to make us good and happy.

[*Here some body in the Room, said, I said; Schism was a damnable Sin. Upon which, Mr. Kirby said:*]

Mr. K. At this rate, you damn all Dissenters.

S. I am very far from it.

Mr. K. Why, yes, you say *Schism is a damnable Sin*, and *all Dissenters are Schismaticks*.

S. There certainly never was a Separation made, but there was then a *Schism* commenc'd. And I need not tell you, that *Schism* is a damnable Sin, for all Sin is in its Nature damnable.

F

Mr. K.

Mr. K. Why the Church of Rome, charges you with *Schism*, what! Are you guilty of a *Damnable Sin*?

S. But as Judge Hales, very well distinguishes, *Not he that makes the Separation, but he that causes it, is the Schismatick.*

Mr. K. Let me hear you prove *Schism* a damnable Sin. You are very brisk.

S. I think I ought not, on so melancholy a Subject. But, certainly, none can be insensible, in this our unhappy *Ist*, of the Mischief, the Sinfulness of *Schism*. Are we not ready, almost, to devour one another? How do we, (who by the Name of *Christians*, and *Members of the same Community*) are under the strictest Obligations to Love and Affection; continually villifie and traduce each other; and are never so happy, as when we have an Opportunity to do so? How vehemently does the Holy Book exhort us, *to avoid those which cause Divisions*? And ranks it amongst the *Works of the Flesh*. Whereas there is, (saith St. Paul) *Divisions amongst you, are you not carnal*? And in another Place, gives the Authors of it the Name of *Dogs*, Beware, says he, of *Dogs*, beware of the *Concision*. All which consider'd 'tis very easie to infer, *That Schism is a damnable Sin.*

Mr. K. Well, I tell you this, I'll engage my self, to give the same, nay, better Reasons, for Our Separation from You, than You can give, for Your Separation from the Church of Rome.

S. You will! Why then, One Reason of our Separation from the Church of Rome, is because it is guilty of Idolatry; nay, makes the

the Practice of it a necessary Term of Her Communion. Now this I do not barely say, but come to the particular Thing, wherein She's guilty, and instance in the *Host*, in which they worship a Piece of Bread, as *Jesus Christ*, the most high God; and so are justly chargeable with *worshipping the Creature instead of the Creator*, which is the highest Instance of Idolatry.

Mr. K. Well, but they don't worship the Bread as God.

S. Yes but they do. For at the Elevation of the *Host*, they all immediately prostrate themselves, having a Notion, that the Bread is *Jesus, the most High God*.

Mr. K. Well, but they don't think it is Bread.

S. But, Sir, you and I know it to be nothing else. [*This I often repeated.*] You may justify them, if you please.

Mr. K. Not I, truly.

S. Why then it is undeniable, they are guilty of Idolatry. [*This, with much ado, was granted.*] The next Question is, Wherein the Church of England is guilty of Idolatry? Idolatry, Sir, for I'll answer to no other Charge.

Mr. K. It's like I can give as good Reasons, tho' not the very same.

S. You said the very same. I ha'n't forgot, I remember what you said.

[*Here we were both very eager in our Expressions, and something loud.*]

Mr. K. Why there is *Baptism*. Aye, that is a very good Reason.

S. Look'e, Sir, I'll answer to nothing but Idolatry, if you talk all Night. Are we guilty of Idolatry, or no?

[*After*

[After some Hesitation, and abundance of Reluctancy, he said :]

Mr. K. Why no, I can't charge you with Idolatry. But—I did not say the same.

S. You did, and therefore must acknowledge, your self fairly Baffled.

[After which, Mr. Kirby show'd some signs of Discontent, and then we proceeded, to some Discourse, concerning Mr. De Laun's Book: Who I said, proceeded upon a False Supposition, in charging those things, which were only the Garments of the Church, and Matters of decency and Order : Which was the only Rule, they were accountable to, as Additions, prohibited by the Scripture ; whereas the prohibition, extended only to matters of Doctrine. Saying, if every Addition in the Circumstantials of Religion was a Crime, then to wear the Hat in the Meeting, to sit at the Communion, wou'd find as much matter for Invectives, as Kneeling, &c. So a great many Words were spent, not worth accounting for, during which he said, he'd be content, to be esteem'd Schismatick, in Case he did not prove, a National Church, to be no true Constituted Church of Christ, (to which I reply'd) I wou'd let the whole matter, depend upon that one Point: And therefore wou'd meet him, or any other any time ; being then so spent, that I was incapable of Disputing any longer, which he did not seem inclin'd to. so the Conference ended ; being carried on, on both Sides with Personal Civility.]

F I N I S.